

REMARKS

1. In paragraph 2 of the Office Action the Examiner has objected to claims 13-22 and 27-37 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being multiply dependent. In reply the Applicant has amended these claims to singly dependent form and requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

2. In paragraph 3 of the Office Action the Examiner has objected to claim 25 because it was dependent from claim 25. In reply the Applicant has amended this claim to depend from claim 24.

3. In paragraph 3 of the Office Action the Examiner has raised a number of clarity objections. These clarity objections are dealt with below:

(a) Claim 38 "substantially": The Applicant submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand "substantially invisible" to mean "substantially invisible to the average unaided human eye". The Applicant submits that the phrase would be well understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

(b) Claims 58 and 59 "possible values": Claims 58 and 59 have been amended to depend from claim 56 where the phrase "possible values" is first introduced, thus overcoming the antecedent issues raised by the Examiner.

(c) Claim 61 "the printer": Claim 61 has been amended to depend from claim 38 thus overcoming the antecedent issues raised by the Examiner.

4. In paragraph 3 of the Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 9-12, 23-34, 26, 38-44, 46-51, 53, 55-74 as being anticipated by Dymetman (US 6,330,976). In reply, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 38 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from Dymetman. The Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Dymetman because Dymetman does not disclose the printing of interface surfaces on demand.

Amended claim 1 defines a method of enabling a user to instruct a computer system to generate a user interface which is printed on demand. The amended claim recites the step of "printing the user interface on a computer interface surface" after the computer has received a request to print the interface from the

user. The interface which is printed is defined as "*including ... substantially invisible coded data, the coded data being indicative of ...an identity of the interface*". In order for the interface printer to be able to print the interface on the interface surface, it must know the identity of the interface. These claim features clearly define a method which includes the printing on demand of interfaces.

Dymetman does not disclose such a method, and, in fact, teaches away from on-demand printing since the Dymetman coded substrates are pre-printed by special "*coded substrate suppliers*". In column 10, lines 16 to 35 of Dymetman the process of allocating a page identifier is outlined. It is clear from this description that the "*coded substrate supplier*" allocates the page-identifier to the coded substrates it produces and associates the page-identifier with a Web page. A third party then buys the coded substrate and adds its own information to the Web page. There is no disclosure of a user being able to request an interface and have a printer print the interface on an interface surface, the interface having its own unique identity and enabling a user to interact with it via a sensing device which senses the coded data.

In the Dymetman system, when a user uses a pointer on a coded substrate the result is either output to a computer screen (see item 4 in Fig 1) or requested information is faxed to the user (see col. 17, lines 46 to 51). However, the output to the computer screen and the document faxed to the user are not coded substrates and therefore do not fit the description of the "*interface surface*" printed in the method of claim 1.

The comment in Dymetman column 11, lines 14 to 15 that "*the production of coded substrate[s] will be a process carried out by specialized machines*" further shows that the Dymetman arrangement only discloses pre-printed coded substrates and does not disclose the printing on demand of interfaces including coded data which is indicative of the identity of the interface.

For these reasons Dymetman does not anticipate amended claim 1. Similar comments apply in relation to amended claim 38. Since independent claims 1 and 38 are novel in light of Dymetman, their corresponding dependent claims are also novel.

Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9818 6711

FAX RECEIVED
APR 1 2 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER